

*proposal  
speech*

General Shepherd and Members of the Carabao.

As one of the few persons here who never happened to have visited the Philippines, I take it as a real compliment to have been asked to speak to all of you Carabaos who in one way or another helped to make the Philippine Republic what it is today. My lack of first-hand knowledge of those far Pacific islands, however, does not permit me exactly to ignore them, for when the Philippines became independent ten years ago, they automatically became of interest to the Agency that I head. We hear a good deal about these islands from time to time, and what we hear usually makes us proud of what the American-nurtured Philippines stand for, particularly in the post-war agitation over "imperialism."

If you follow Soviet propaganda, you know that the name of any capitalist country--and particularly that of the United States--is constantly bracketed with the word "imperialist." As we know only too well, Communist propaganda has had a good deal of success with this repetitive approach, despite the ironies and absurdities that it entails.

The American connection with the Philippine Islands makes a good example of the kind of American "imperialism" that the Communists would like to forget. Even today the fact is not without significance that when President McKinly got word that Spain had been defeated at Manila Bay, he did not even know where the Philippine Islands were. By his own account, he had to look up their location on a map. This was a fine background for a deep-laid capitalist plot! Then McKinly agreed to annexation, but only because he could see no feasible alternative to it under the circumstances of 1899. But the treaty of annexation contained a guarantee that the Philippines would be given independence within a stated time, and, as all the world knows, when the time came, we honored that guarantee.

All of this must have seemed fearfully naive to the Czarist government of 1899, and certainly must seem even more naive, in their private opinion, to the Soviet rulers today. Yet they cannot escape the fact that as a result of this very unimperialist policy, we have firm friends in the far Western Pacific who seem to have thrived on our "imperialism."

At least we don't find the Filipinos particularly friendly to the Soviet Union even though it poses as the real friend of countries like theirs, suffering under the heel of American tyranny.

The one important Communist element in the Philippines, the Huka-- so menacing a few years ago, are now either in jail or scattered to the jungles--not by any action of ours but through the determination of the Filipinos' own very young government. The other Filipino communists consist of a few native party members [CIA figures, 3,000-5,000] and some of the overseas Chinese in Manila [CIA figures, about 3,000 out of 500,000]. In other words, Communism, which never did get a very good start in our former dependency, is now practically reduced to a harmless remnant--all through the efforts of a people who certainly would have had a right to resent "capitalist-imperialism" if there ever had been such a thing in their country.

It could be said, it seems to me, that the history of our connection with the Philippine Islands is a glowing example of how American democracy has worked and will work in the world. And I am sure that however modestly you might disclaim it, many of you gentlemen, in the course of your service in the Philippines, played an important part in building the new Philippine Republic, which now stands as an important obstacle to the progress of international communism in the Far East.

International communism, meanwhile, has had troubles of recent days, which are mostly the result of real imperialism as practiced by the new Russian empire. For example, <sup>if</sup> you have been following the plight of the American communist party of recent days, you have seen a sad lot of people in a melancholy dilemma. It seems

to be getting so bad, in fact, that stern orders have been coming from Moscow--through London it seems--that the American Communists are to mend their ways, and by all means refrain from slanders against the Communists of the USSR. This seems a cruel way to treat such faithful people as our indigenous Marxists who followed Stalin through thick and thin until the Kremlin would let them follow him no more!

And the American communists are not alone in their woes. In all non-communist countries the Marxist faithful have had to do some handsome juggling of ridiculous paradoxes under circumstances that left them hardly any tenable positions in the countries where they operate.

But these recent cases of extreme embarrassment, encouraging as they may be, must not be allowed to lull us into a sense of false security. International communism--whatever its ups and downs--its twisting and turnings--its mergers for momentary advantage with political parties within the democracies--never really changes.

Communist parties are usually small. In the Soviet Union itself, the membership of the party is a minority of the citizens. But even in countries where Communists have a voting strength of five per cent or less of the electorate, they have usually been able to exert an influence out of all proportion to their size. The Philippine example is one of many, where discontented farmers were many and communists few, but where the few communists led the many farmers in a way calculated to do maximum harm to the Philippine government. Today in North Africa, where the Communists are

numerically weak, they abet every disruptive move taken by extreme Nationalists. In South America--as in the case of Guatemala where they almost succeeded,--the Communist few take advantage of every opportunity to rule the non-communist many.

In addition to the Communist party organizations, the Moscow master plan includes a long list of highly active and vocal front organizations, ready for action in their particular sphere, for example:

(1) The World Federation of Trade Unions, which failed in its original plan to dominate all unions organized under the United Nations, but even now, claims a membership of some 20 million outside the Iron Curtain, dispersed among fifty-seven countries of the non-Communist world.

(2) The World Peace Council, which figures largely in Soviet propaganda and has had some success, even in the United States.

(3) The International Union of Students and the World Federation of Democratic Youth, claiming a combined membership of 80 million, used as a mechanism to recruit and indoctrinate new party cadres of able young men from the free world.

(4) The International Association of "Democratic" Lawyers, which was used as a front to propagate the lie that we had employed bacteriological warfare in Korea.

(5) The Women's International Democratic Federation which we estimate must cost the Communists some six million dollars a year in the form of sending large delegations from some forty different countries to various international meetings.

In the nature of things, the Communists can count on the continued existence of discontent. Where the people want land, the Communists promise them land, particularly when it is land that belongs to somebody else. Where a strong motivating force is nationalism--as currently in parts of the Middle East, or in South America, or even in the Philippines--the Communists can pose as the most nationalistic of all--always ready to help stamp out imperialism--unless it is the particular kind of imperialism which it is their purpose to further. And when Soviet imperialism comes face to face with a revolt of people with sincere nationalist aspirations--then the whole thing can be explained on grounds that all the revolutionists were puppets being manipulated by the ghost of Hitler.

- 6 -

the world. This challenge, we shall have to meet, just as much in times when the communist world apparatus appears to be in a state of confusion and dismay, as when it seems to be making steady and frightening progress.

From an Italian newspaper I offer you this quotation: "If one is honest and a Communist, he is not intelligent. If one is intelligent and a Communist, he is not honest. If one is intelligent and honest, he cannot be a Communist."